J Indian Philos (2010) 38:107–131
DOI 10.1007/s10781-010-9085-9

On Incompetent Monks and Able Urbane Nuns in a Buddhist Monastic Code

Gregory Schopen

Published online: 24 March 2010

Abstract Most modern scholars seem to assume that Buddhist monks in early India had a good knowledge of Buddhist doctrine and at least of basic Buddhist texts. But the compilers of the *vinayas* or monastic codes seem not to have shared this assumption. The examples presented here are drawn primarily from one *vinaya*, and show that the compilers put in place a whole series of rules to deal with situations in which monks were startlingly ignorant of both doctrine and text. One of these examples is particularly interesting for what it suggests about the linguistic sophistication of nuns, and another because it presents a case in which a nun is required to fill an important liturgical role in public and in the presence of monks.

Keywords Buddhist monasticism · Vinaya · Buddhist nuns · Textual knowledge

The redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* can probably not be easily accused of presenting an overinflated view of the level of textual or doctrinal learning of the monks they were trying to govern. In fact scattered throughout this massive *Vinaya* are any number of indications that they either saw, or foresaw, situations in which the monks they were writing for were, or would be, either ill-informed or, frankly, very stupid. An easily available example might be found in the account in the *Vinayavibhaṅga* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* of the painting of the wheel of rebirth that was to be made on a monastery's porch.[1] When it has been painted there

[1] We now have not one, but two excellent studies of such paintings and the texts dealing with them: Teiser (2006) and Zin and Schlingloff (2007).

G. Schopen (✉)
Department of Asian Languages and Cultures, University of California,
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1540, USA
e-mail: schopen@humnet.ucla.edu

and brahmans and householders see it they ask the monks what it is. But the monks say in regard to the pictorial representation of what is supposed to be a central Buddhist doctrine "We, sirs, also do not know" (*bhadramukhā vayam api na jānima iti*).[2] Who these monks were is not stated, but they are represented as not knowing what was painted on their own monastery's wall. But the text goes on to explicitly say that some monks in the Community were not just uninformed, but stupid. As a result of this exchange between monks and visiting lay men the text then says:

> The Blessed One said: "A Monk must be assigned to be on the porch who will instruct the brahmans and householders who continually come!"
>
> When the Blessed One had said "A monk must be assigned," the monks assigned without distinction even the ignorant, the stupid, the simple, the incompetent (…*te aviśeṣeṇoddiśanti bālān api mūḍhān apy avyaktān apy akuśalān api*).[3] They themselves did not know, how much less will they instruct the brahmans and householders who continually came.
>
> The Blessed One said: "A competent (*pratibala*) monk must be assigned!"[4]

Here the ignorance of monks emerges at two points. First the generality of monks encountered by lay visitors to the *vihāra* lacked the requisite knowledge needed to explain the painting and the doctrine represented. Then, second, the text indicates that all monks were not "competent," and that some at least were "ignorant," "stupid," etc. While the frankness here might be a little startling, it should be kept in mind that *Vinaya* texts were not meant for public consumption, but were strictly—*very* strictly—in-house documents, hence their considerable historical value. It is also true that there is nothing even vaguely exceptional about this passage and even some of its exact language occurs elsewhere. Another passage in the *Vibhaṅga* is a particularly good example.

2 The canonical version of the account is preserved in Tibetan at *Vibhaṅga*, Derge 'dul ba Ja 113b.3–122a.7 (all references to Tibetan texts are to *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Taipei Edition*, ed. A.W. Barber (Taipei: 1991), and will always follow the same format: Sanskrit title–section–volume letter–original folio and line number. When a text is from the *Bstan 'gyur* that will always be indicated); there is also a Sanskrit version of the text, which Peri (1917, p. 47, n. 3) long ago described as "un peu abrégée," reproduced in the *Divyāvadāna*, Cowell and Neil (1886, pp. 298–314), and a Chinese version translated in Teiser (2006, pp. 53–56). The Sanskrit version is cited here.

3 Tibetan: *de dag bye brag med par byis pa yang rung / rmongs ba yang rung / mi gsal ba yang rung / mi mkhas pa yang rung ba las bsko bar byed nas…* Derge, 'dul ba Ja 115a.6. The Chinese version appears to soften this—Teiser (2006, p. 56) translates: "Then the *bhikṣus* made a poor choice: they appointed someone who lacked understanding…"

4 To judge by a text in the *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Da 178b.4, such an appointment was not always made or honored even in narrative time. Here when the nuns designated to declare the purity of the nuns go to the monastery they find on the porch only "an Ājīvika…sitting there pondering on the wheel of rebirth with its five parts," who they mistake for the monk who was supposed to give the admonition with, of course, some amusing results. There is also no reference to such a monk in a passage from the *Vibhaṅga* that refers to a young lady looking at the painting on the monastery's porch that is cited at Schopen (2006, p. 497)—note that in the translation given there "paintings" should probably be corrected both times to "painting."

By the time of the *Vinayas* it was an established rule that on the occasion of the "fortnightly gathering" (*upoṣadha*) a monk was to admonish (*avavadati*) or give "admonishment" (*avavāda*) to the Community of Nuns. This requirement is presented, however, as creating a long series of problems.[5] As one solution the Buddha is made to rule that a monk must be appointed as the "Admonisher-of-Nuns" (*dge slong ma ston pa* = *bhikṣuṇyavavādaka*) by a formal act of the assembled male Community, but then the same thing that happened in the case of the appointment of a monk to explain the wheel of rebirth happened here, and it is described in virtually the same words:

> [6]When the Blessed One had said "the Community must assign the Admonisher-of-Nuns" it assigned without distinction even the ignorant, the stupid, the simple, the incompetent (*de dag bus pa yang rung rmongs pa yang rung / mi gsal ba yang rung / mi mkhas pa yang rung ste bye brag med par sko bar byed nas*…), and since they themselves were untrained it was not possible for them to train others, themselves not being tranquil it was not possible to make others so,…

When this occurred in the case of the monk who was to be assigned to explain the wheel of rebirth the Buddha—as we have seen—was made to require that the monk be "competent" (*pratibala*), without further defining what that meant. In the case of the "Admonisher of Nuns," however, he is presented as being more precise, and the requirements here are of interest for both what they suggest about monks and what they suggest about nuns.

> [7]The Blessed One said: "One possessed of five essential qualities must be assigned as the Admonisher-of-Nuns! Which five? He is possessed of good conduct (*tshul khrims dang ldan pa* = *śīlavat*); is one of great learning (*mang du thos pa* = *bahuśruta*); is a Princely Elder (*gnas brtan rgyal tshab lta bu* = *sthaviro bhavati rājanya*)[8]; he is one possessed of urbane speech (*grong khyer pa'i skad* = *nāgaralapita*); and he is one who has not offended a nun by touching her with his body, and even if he has offended one he has properly made amends for that offence. How is one possessed of good conduct? One of whom there is no commission of any of the offences among the four deserving of expulsion (*pham par 'gyur ba* = *pārājika*) is thus possessed of good conduct. How is one of great learning? One who has recited and learned in full the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* is thus one of great learning. How is one a Princely

[5] See for Mūlasarvāstivādin sources *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, Banerjee (1977, p. 34) *Pātayantikas* 21–23; *Vibhaṅga*, Derge 'dul ba Ja 50b.6–90b.5; *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Da 177a.4–179b.4. For Pāli sources *Pātimokha*, Pruitt and Norman (2003, pp. 52–53) *Pācittiyas* 21–24; Pāli *Vinaya*, Oldenberg (1879–1883, Vol. IV, pp. 49–58).

[6] *Vibhaṅga*, Derge 'dul ba Ja 60a.4–6. Keeping in mind that Tibetan *bus pa* and *byis pa* are virtually interchangeable, notice that the characterization of the monks here in Tibetan is all but identical with that found in the Tibetan translation of the text dealing with monks who were assigned to explain the wheel, and it can therefore be assumed that the underlying Sanskrit here was exactly the same.

[7] *Vibhaṅga*, Derge 'dul ba Ja 60a.6; *Vinayasūtra*, Sankrityayana (1981, p. 42.5).

[8] On this category of monk, defined immediately below, see also Schopen (2000, p. 140, I. 9), and add for what seems to be the related Pāli *rattaññu*: Norman (1992, pp. 165–167).

Elder? One who has been ordained for 20 or more years is thus a Princely Elder. How is one possessed of urbane speech? The court is called urbane; one possessed of its speech is thus one possessed of urbane speech. How is one one who has not offended a nun by touching her with his body? One who has not brought his body into contact with a nun is thus one who has not offended a nun by touching her with his body.''

It might first be incidentally noted here that a similar list occurs in the Pāli *Vibhaṅga* but the list there is considerably more developed—it has a formal list of eight required characteristics, but then adds many more in explanation,[9] and although the Pāli *Vibhaṅga* does not explicitly refer to incompetent or stupid monks its *Bhikkhunī-Khandhaka* has a specific rule against ''ignorant'' (*bāla*) monks admonishing nuns.[10] The Mūlasarvāstivādin list, however, not only occurs in a large number of places—it is repeated in the *Uttaragrantha*, in at least five commentaries, in Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* and his (?) *Ekottarakarmaśataka*, in Viśākhadeva's *Vinayakārikā*, and in Viśeṣamitra's *Vinayasaṃgraha*—but remains almost entirely consistent across this wide range of sources.

The fourth of the Mūlasarvāstivādin required characteristics may reveal something important about the social standing of the nuns this tradition had to deal with. It indicates that the monk who was to admonish nuns *must be* ''possessed of urbane speech.'' In the one source that we have in Sanskrit—Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra*—the term used is *nāgara-lapita*, and this is translated into Tibetan as *grong khyer ba'i skad smra ba*, literally: ''one speaking the language of those living in a city.''[11] It is, of course, not absolutely certain that Guṇaprabha uses exactly the same Sanskrit term that was used in the canonical sources, but the latter could not have been, in sense, very different. In the *Vibhaṅga* passage translated above the Tibetan has *grong khyer pa'i skad dang ldan pa*; the *Uttaragrantha* has *grong khyer gyi skad dang ldan pa*[12]—the first meaning literally ''possessed of the speech or language of those living in a city,'' the second ''possessed of the speech or language of the city.'' The *Vibhaṅga* also explicitly identifies the speech or language of those living in a city with the language of the court—*pho brang 'khor = antaḥpura*, *rājakula*—and the *Mahāvyutpatti* gives *paurī-sāṃkathya* as the equivalent of *pho brang 'khor gyi skad*.[13] Viśeṣamitra combines both in giving the fourth characteristic as *pho brang 'khor ram / grong khyer gyi skad*, ''the speech/language of the court or of the city,'' and in Viśākhadeva it appears as *phun tshogs tshig ldan*,

9 Pāli *Vinaya*, Oldenberg (1879–1883, Vol. IV, p. 51) = Horner (1938–1966, Vol. II, pp. 265–267).

10 Pāli *Vinaya*, Oldenberg (1879–1883, Vol. II, p. 264–65) = Horner (1938–1966, Vol. V, p. 366).

11 *Vinayasūtra*, Sankrityayana (1981, p. 42.5) = *Vinayasūtra*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Wu 33a.7.

12 *Uttaragrantha*, Derge 'dul ba Pa 33b.6. This passage in the *Uttaragrantha*, like its parallel in the *Vibhaṅga*, originally must have defined each of the five required characteristics. But in its present form there are only four definitions. That for the fourth had, almost certainly as the result of an eye-skip, either already dropped out of the Sanskrit text the Tibetan translators had, or, from the same cause, has dropped out of the Tibetan text in the course of transmission.

13 *Mahāvyutpatti*, Sakaki (1916, No. 2808). Goldstein (2001, p. 685) defines modern Tibetan *po brang skor gyi skad* as ''the King's English, court language.''

"having well turned or elegant (*saṃpanna*) speech."[14] That a monk who was to admonish nuns was required to speak in this way, was required to have urbane, courtly, and elegant speech, would seem to make sense only if the nuns the redactors of this *Vinaya* knew spoke in this register and were themselves urbane—a monk, in other words, was required to speak this way because that was the way nuns spoke. This in turn would suggest that the nuns the redactors thought their monks would have to deal with were most decidedly not country bumpkins or farmers' daughters, but sophisticated and urbane women. The fact that this had to be made a specific requirement would also seem to suggest that not all the monks the redactors knew would be able to speak at such a level or in the same sophisticated register that nuns did.[15] But there appears to be an odd contrast between what was required of the monk who was to admonish nuns in the domain of conversational or speaking skills, and what was required of him in the areas of ecclesiastical behavior and textual knowledge.

In contrast to what might be considered the high expectations in regard to a monk's speaking skills, the "good conduct" (*śīla*) required of the monk who was to admonish nuns seems to have been rather minimal. Both the *Vibhaṅga* and the parallel in the *Uttaragrantha* define "possessed of good conduct" to be nothing more than not having committed any of the four most serious monastic offences or *pārājikas*. Guṇaprabha indicates the same when he substitutes *aparājita*, "undefeated," for *śīlavat*, and commentaries on the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, if they gloss the term, repeat what was said in the *Vibhaṅga*.[16] None of the post-canonical sources, in fact, appears to go beyond this minimal definition in this case, nor do any deal with the seeming fact that any monk who had committed a *pārājika* would already have been disqualified as an admonisher of nuns: a monk who committed a *pārājika* either ceased to be a monk, and therefore could not be so assigned; or if he chose—as we now know he could—to remain a member of the Community he would have to have accepted the status of a *śikṣādattaka* in a formal ritual, and a *śikṣādattaka* was explicitly forbidden to act as an admonisher of nuns.[17]

But if the redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* required relatively little to qualify as "possessed of good conduct" (*śīlavat*), they also seem not to have expected very much from one who they describe as "having great learning" (*bahuśruta*). In the *Vibhaṅga* such a one need only "have recited and learned in full the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*," and although we might have thought this would be a bare

[14] *Vinayasaṃgraha*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Nu 209a.3; *Vinayakārikā*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Shu 29b.5—see also *Vinayavibhaṅgapadavyākhyāna*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Tshu 142b.1; *Prātimokṣasūtrapaddhati*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Du 141a.1; *Prātimokṣasūtraṭīkāvinayasamuccaya*, Derge bstan 'gyur,'dul ba Phu 83b.7; *Prātimokṣasūtravṛtti*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Bu 91b.1; *Prātimokṣabhāṣyāsaṃpramuṣitasmaraṇamātralekha*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Mu 97a.3. That Mūlasarvāstivādin nuns would be expected to speak as city-dwellers did would also be in harmony with this group's rule that its nunneries must be located in towns—see Schopen (2008a, 2009b).

[15] Pāli requirements also refer to the monk's speech but rather more generically: *kalyāṇavāco hoti kalyāṇavākkaraṇo*, Pāli *Vinaya*, Oldenberg (1879–1883, Vol. IV, p. 51) = "he comes to be of charming speech, of charming delivery," Horner (1938–1966, Vol. II, p. 266); cf. Cone (2001, p. 657): "of excellent speech, having a fine speaking voice."

[16] See footnotes 7, 11, 12 and 14 for references for all of these.

[17] See now Clarke (2000, 2009, esp. p. 27).

minimum this is also the full or only requirement in the *Uttaragrantha* as well. In fact the latter may require even less: it defines "one of great learning" as "one who expounds the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra or* has recited it" (*des so sor thar pa'i mdo bshad pa 'am kha ton du byas par gyur ba'o*). Some of the post-canonical sources also repeat this in one form or another: Viśeṣamitra says one is qualified as "of great learning" because he "has heard in detail the recitation of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*" (*mang du thos pa ste / so sor thar pa'i mdo gdon pa rgya chen* (rd: *cher*) *thos pa'i phyir*); and an anonymous commentary on the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* says: "'having great learning' means he is able to explain the complete *Prātimokṣa* and knows how to recite it" (*mang du thos pa ni so sor thar pa rgyas pa 'chad nus shing kha ton du shes pa'o*).[18] But other post-canonical sources in this case—unlike what was seen in the case of *śīlavat*—appear to go far beyond the narrow definition of *bahuśruta* found in the *Vibhaṅga* or *Uttaragrantha*. The *Prātimokṣasūtravṛtti*, another anonymous commentary, for example, replaces *bahuśruta* with the far, far broader *sde snod gsum 'dzin pa = tripiṭaka-dhara*, or "Preserver of the Three Baskets," and Guṇaprabha does much the same in his *Vinayasūtra*: he replaces the canonical *bahuśruta* with *sūtravinayamātṛkā-dhara*, "one who preserves the *Sūtra* and *Vinaya* and Summaries."[19] However, the *Ekottarakarmaśataka*, a manual of formal monastic acts also attributed to Guṇaprabha in the Tibetan tradition, appears to go in two different directions. It retains the term *bahuśruta = mang du thos pa*, without defining it, but then says: "If there is no monk of great learning, then a reciter of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* can also be assigned. If there is not even such a one, then one who is able to teach the eight *pārājikas* for nuns and the eight heavy rules can also be assigned." And it seems—the text here is not altogether clear to me—even to allow for the situation where there is no monk who can do even that little or who knows even that.[20]

It might be noted that the rewordings found in the *Prātimokṣasūtravṛtti* and the *Vinayasūtra* only emphasize the very limited nature of the body of knowledge that a monk needed to have in the canonical sources to be qualified or considered "one of great learning": he need only know one short *Vinaya* text, and there is no mention at all of any doctrinal text in the canonical sources. This does not seem to be asking much, and yet the mere fact that this had to be made an explicit requirement must almost unavoidably suggest that not all monks that the redactors knew even that much. The *Ekottarakarmaśataka* would seem, in fact, to make this explicit, and it is not alone.

---

[18] *Vinayasaṃgraha*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Nu 209a.3; *Prātimokṣabhāṣyāsaṃpramuṣitasmaraṇamātralekha*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Mu 97a.3. Given the ongoing discussion of the relationship of the Mūlasarvāstivāda and the Sarvāstivāda it is perhaps worth noting that the remark in Banerjee (1957, pp. 40–41) in regard to the first of these is incorrect—at least in the Derge printing the concluding title is *'phags pa gzhi thams cad yod par smra ba'i 'dul ba bsdus pa* (Nu 268a.2), that is to say *Ārya-Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinayasaṃgraha*, not *Sarvāstivāda-vinayasaṃgraha*.

[19] *Prātimokṣasūtravṛtti*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Bu 191b.1; *Vinayasūtra*, Sankrityayana (1981, p. 42.5)

[20] *Ekottarakarmaśataka*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Wu 160a.4.

Most modern scholars probably assume that all monks knew—at a minimum—the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*.[21] But the redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* do not seem to have made the same assumption. To judge by a detailed text in their *Kṣudrakavastu* they seem to have made a very different assumption. At least they envisioned, or made rules to govern, situations in which even senior monks were incapable of reciting the *Prātimokṣa*, and they foresaw or provided rules to deal with the possibility that no one in a given *vihāra* might be able to do so. Although not short, and characteristically repetitive, this text deserves to be translated in full.

> [22]The Buddha, the Blessed One, was staying in Śrāvastī, in the Jetavana, in the Park of Anāthapiṇḍada.
>
> The Blessed One had said "each half month at the time of the fortnightly gathering (*upoṣadha*) there must be a recitation of the *Prātimokṣa*!" But when the monks did not know by whom the recitation should be done, the Blessed One said: "By the Elder of the Community (*dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan* = *saṅgha-sthavir*a)[23] the recitation must be done!"
>
> When the Blessed One had said "by the Elder of the Community the recitation must be done," then each half month at the time of the fortnightly gathering the Elder of the Community undertook the recitation. But then the Elder who lived in a certain *vihāra* was not competent (*aśakta*) to recite, and the monks said to him: "Elder, the time for the fortnightly gathering has arrived—why are you not thinking about that?"
>
> He said, "Venerables, since I am not competent, how will I do it?"
>
> The monks reported the situation to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One said: "If the Elder of the Community is incompetent, by the Second Elder (*gnas brtan gnyis pas* = *dvitīyasthavira*)[24] it must be recited!"

---

[21] See for one example von Hinüber (1997, p. 72): "Although the minimum knowledge expected from every monk is much more than the *Pātimokkhasutta*,…"

[22] *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge, 'dul ba Tha 201b.2-202b.5—see also Pāli *Vinaya*, Oldenberg (1879–1883, Vol. I, pp. 115–17, 119) = Horner (1938–1966, Vol. IV, pp. 152–53, 156–157); in the first of these the Elder (*thera*) who is supposed to recite the *Pātimokkha* is not competent to do so and is described as *bālo hoti avyatto*, "stupid and ignorant"; then a whole series of monks—in two cases the entire Community—who are equally unable to do so are described in the same way. These passages would seem to suggest that the redactors of the Pāli *Vinaya* had many of the same (realistic?) assumptions about the textual learning of their monks that their Mūlasarvāstivādin colleagues had about theirs, perhaps—as we will see below—for some of the same reasons.

[23] On the rank, office, and status—it appears to be all three—see footnote 27 below.

[24] *dvitīya-sthavira*, and *tṛtīya-sthavira* just below, do not appear to mean "*a* second elder" or "*a* third elder," but "*the* Second Elder" and "*the* Third Elder." They, in other words, appear to be formal designations of rank, office or status, titles in the administrative system meant to order Mūlasarvāstivādin communities. Although—like all Mūlasarvāstivādin administrative titles—they have not yet been properly studied, they occur in a number of places; see for some examples: *Śayanāsanavastu*, Gnoli (1978, p. 39); *Varṣāvastu*, Dutt (1942–1950, Vol. III, Pt. 4, pp. 133–134); *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge, 'dul ba Da

When the Blessed One had said "by the Second Elder it must be recited," then the Second Elder in a certain *vihāra* was also incompetent, and when the monks reported the situation to the Blessed One the Blessed One said: "If the Second Elder is also incompetent, by the Third Elder it must be recited!"

When the Blessed One had said "by the Third Elder it must be recited," then even the Third Elder in a certain *vihāra* was incompetent, and the monks reported the situation to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One said: "If the Third Elder is also incompetent, it must be recited by the monks reading by turns!"[25]

When the Blessed One had said: "It must be recited by the monks reading by turns" the monks begin to recite it reading by turns. But when the turn fell on some of those among the monks who were to recite by turns who were competent, and on some who were not competent, those who were competent when their turn came performed the recitation of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* then each half month, but those who were not competent when their turn came said, since they did not know it, "How will I do it?"

The monks reported the situation to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One said: "He must entrust it to one who is competent!"

When the Blessed One had said "when the turn falls on one who is not competent he must then entrust it to another," then in a certain *vihāra* the incompetent one on whom the turn fell entrusted to another and when that one was not fit, the monks reported the situation to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One said: "It must always only be entrusted to another who is competent!"

When the Blessed One had said "each half month the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* must be recited by the Elder of the Community. If not him, by the Second Elder. Even if not him, by the Third Elder. If still not him, it must be recited by reading it in turn, or it must be entrusted to another who is competent!", and there being no one at all in a certain *vihāra* who could recite the whole teaching of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, the Elder of the Community recited the four

Footnote 24 continued
191b.3; *Vinayasūtra*, Sankrityayana (1981, p. 77.10), which is digesting the *Kṣudrakavastu* passage being translated here. The first of these would seem to indicate that the Second and Third Elders could get decreasingly smaller shares of the donations that came in. There may be a reflection of this tripartite system at Pāli *Vinaya*, Oldenberg (1879–1883, Vol. I, p. 116), but Horner (1938–1966, Vol. IV, p. 153) does not see it so—she translates *dutiyatheraṃ ajjhesiṃsu…tatiyatheraṃ ajjhesiṃsu…*as "they called upon a second elder…they called upon a third elder…"; and to judge on the basis of the *Abhisamācārikā* alone some form of this 'system'—perhaps limited to the *saṅghasthavira* and the *dvitīya-sthavira*—was also in place in the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*; see Singh and Minowa (1988, pp. 81.5ff, 84.3ff, 86.15ff, etc.), and here too one or another, or both, can be incompetent (*na pratibalo bhavati*).

[25] *gal te gnas brtan gsum pas kyang ma nus na dge slong rnams kyis res su bklags te kha ton gdon par bya'o* /.

offences deserving expulsion (*pārājika*) and even though the rest was not recited the monks held the fortnightly gathering.

The monks reported the situation to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One said: "The fortnightly gathering must not be held. However, whoever can recite something, he should recite that: if the Elder of the Community can recite the four offences deserving expulsion, he must recite those, someone else the thirteen offences requiring suspension (*saṃghāvaśeṣñ*), someone else the two undetermined offences (*aniyata*), someone else the thirty offences causing a fall which involve forfeiture (*niḥsargika-pātayantikā*), someone else the ninety offences causing a fall (*pātayantikā*), someone else the four offences requiring confession (*pratideśanīya*), someone else the numerous rules of good behavior (*śaikṣā dharmāḥ*), someone else the seven rules for allaying disputes (*adhikaraṇa-śamatha*)—if the divisions of the fortnightly gathering are combined in this way I do not say there would be an obstacle to the fortnightly gathering,"

These same rules, of course, also appear in various Mūlasarvāstivādin handbooks like Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* (with its four Indian commentaries), his *Ekottarakarmaśataka*, and Viśeṣamitra's *Vinayasaṃgraha*, indicating at least that these provisions remained in place for a very long time.[26] But since such handbooks were apparently meant to be comprehensive, and would therefore be bound to repeat whatever was found in the canonical *Vinaya*, they may not tell us very much about their compilers current expectations or situation. It is the expectations and assumptions of the compilers of the canonical *Vinaya* then that are most clearly reflected in these rules, and it would appear that those compilers at least did not have the same generous view of many—if not most—modern scholars in regard to the extent of textual learning on the part of Buddhist monks. They certainly did not seem to assume that all monks would know at least the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*. They appear not even to have assumed that all senior monks (*saṃghasthaviras*) would know the whole of this comparatively short work. And these monks appear to have been both institutionally and spiritually at the head of Buddhist monastic communities.[27] Indeed, the compilers of the canonical *Vinaya* seem to have assumed, or expected, or foresaw situations in which even the most senior monks

[26] *Vinayasūtra*, Sankrityayana (1981, p. 77.10) = Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Wu 60b.7; *Vinayasūtravṛttyabhidhānasvavyākhyāna*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Zu 92a.5; *Vinayasūtraṭīkā*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Yu 127a.7; *Vinayasūtravyākhyāna*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Ru 181a.1; *Vinayasūtravṛtti*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Lu 226b.3; *Ekottarakarmaśataka*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Wu 211a.6; *Vinayasaṃgraha*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Nu 97a.5.

[27] von Hinüber (1997, p. 71) says that "the highest rank a monk can reach is *saṃghathera*, 'Elder of the Order,'" but this "rank," office or status—again it appears to be all three—has not yet been systematically studied even in the Pāli *Vinaya*, and very recent work on Buddhist monastic organization and administration involving the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition is so unreliable, and has been so haphazardly done, that the *saṃghasthavira* is scarcely even mentioned. Given this a sampling of passages from the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya* referring to this office might be useful: *Vibhaṅga*, Derge 'dul ba Ca 154a.6

might only know the four *pārājikas*, or most serious offences, and while this might be surprising to us it is not out of keeping with other provisions in this *Vinaya*: its *Kṣudrakavastu* contains a long and amusing account of how a monk was seduced by his former wife that ends with the rule that the four *pārājikas*—but only them—must be explained in detail to an individual as soon as he has entered the Order (*de lta bas na gnang gis rab tu byung ma thag tu phas pham par gyur ba'i chos bzhi rgyas par shod cig*)[28]; and the rules governing the ordination ceremony found in its *Pravrajyāvastu* and elsewhere only require that the four *pārājikas* be declared to the ordinand—the rest of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, the text in effect says, can be picked up over time from a variety of sources: the fortnightly recitation, preceptors, fellow students, etc.[29] But the compilers of the canonical *Vinaya* seem to have assumed that it would not be just senior monks who would not know the entire *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*. They at least make provisions for situations in which any number of rank and file monks would not, and even provide for or foresee occasions in which not a single monk in a given monastery would know the complete text, or situations in which if a monk knew anything of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, he would know only one of its divisions, and each division was known by a different monk in a given community. The assumptions or expectations of the compilers of this *Vinaya* in regard to the textual knowledge of monks, then, differed radically from what is commonly found in our modern handbooks—they seem to take as a given the possibility that numerous monks would be incapable of reciting even the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*. The *Prātimokṣa*, however, was not the only thing they assumed monks might not be able to recite, nor was the wheel of rebirth the only thing they assumed monks might not be able to explain or teach. Yet another text in the *Kṣudrakavastu*—one that has

Footnote 27 continued
(he "assigns the reward" for a donor's gift—see below p. 13ff); Ca 155b.7 (a novice is confused for a *saṃghasthavira* because he has a great deal of personal property); Ca 156a.6 (he recites the *Prātimokṣa*); Ca 157a.6 (he must make sure that the door of the *vihāra* is locked at night and that the *upadhivāraka*—another office still not well understood, but here under the supervision of the *saṃghasthavira*—has done his tasks); Cha 155b.1 (his name and that of the *upadhivāraka* must be recorded in a contract for a loan made by the Community—here, and, it appears, wherever the two are mentioned together, the *saṃghasthavira* always comes first); Nya 201a.2 (= *Divyāvadāna*, Cowell and Neil (1886, p. 543.14)—he, followed by the *upadhivāraka*, is one whose commands are inviolable: *ājñā akopyā*); *Varṣāvastu*, Dutt (1942–1950, Vol. III, Pt. 4, p. 133.12—the edition here is not good)(he must be presented with the keys to the *vihāra* and must ritually accept it, its donations and its robes funds, at the beginning of the rain-retreat); *Pravrajyāvastu*, Dutt (1942–1950, Vol. III, Pt. 4, pp. 70–71) (he is an arhat who can see the state of rebirth of the deceased); *Śayanāsanavastu*, Gnoli (1978, p. 37) (he recites the verses for the dead donors of the *vihāra*); *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Tha 72a.5 (enforces local ordinances and assigns sponsors to incoming monks); Tha 206a.4 (gives the 'blessing' to the donor of cloth to the Community); Tha 257b.7 (must inform the donor of a meal how the food is to be distributed depending on the number of monks and amount of food made available); *Uttaragrantha*, Derge 'dul ba Pa 71b.4 (must keep track of the monastery's calendar and the dates); Pa 177b.3 (must determine or set the price of items to be sold in monastic auctions). (For some of these see also *Vinayasūtra*, Sankrityayana (1981, pp. 33.13, 59.10, 73.17, 77.10, 78.13, 88.14, 89.12, 91.3).) These passages, again, represent only a sampling, but they would already seem to indicate that the *saṃghasthavira* was certainly an important figure—perhaps even the most important—in Mūlasarvāstivādin monasticism. Given their wide distribution it is very hard to imagine how any study of administrative roles in Indian Buddhist monasticism could have overlooked this figure's significance.

[28] *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Tha 100a.3–102a.5.

[29] *Pravrajyāvastu*, Eimer (1983, Vol. 2, p. 164.5), translated at Schopen (2004c, p. 250).

some features in common with the text dealing with the recitation of the *Prātimokṣa*—would seem to indicate that its compilers assumed that even very senior or high ranking monks would be incapable of teaching *Dharma* to devout householders.

> [30]The setting was in Śrāvastī.
>
> A householder who was rich, had great wealth and extensive property, lived in Śrāvastī, and he at one time, being devout in regard to the Buddha, being devout in regard to the *Dharma* and the Community, invited the Community of Monks headed by the Buddha to a meal at his house, and the Community of Monks went. The Buddha, the Blessed One, to achieve an objective,[31] remained away and had alms brought to him.
>
> From the words: 'For five reasons Buddhas, Blessed Ones, to achieve an objective, remain away and have alms brought to them,' up to the words: 'In this case the Blessed One, wishing to promulgate a rule of training in the *Vinaya* for his disciples, to achieve this objective stayed away and had alms brought to him,' as before[32]
>
> When the monks had eaten the meal they left just like that, and that householder, having wanted to hear the *Dharma*, looked around, and there being not even a single monk there, he complained. Hearing of that situation, monks reported it to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One said: "Monks, since there is a foundation to the complaint of that householder, a monk therefore must not just go away after having eaten a meal. He must teach to a donor (*sbyin bdag* = *dānapati*) who wants the *Dharma*! If he goes without teaching he comes to be guilty of an offence."
>
> When the Blessed One had said "he must teach to a donor who wants the *Dharma*," and the monks did not know who was to teach, the Blessed One said: "The Elder of the Community must teach! If he is not competent, the Second Elder must! If he too is incompetent, monks must be appointed in sequence! Or if there is another who is competent, he must be requested!"

---

[30] *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Da 191a.4–b.4.

[31] *rdzas kyis bsgrubs pa na*. The Sanskrit here (see footnote 32) would have been *aupadhika* (*'sthāt*), and the expression in both languages is open to more than one interpretation. The definition of *aupadhika* in Edgerton (1953) may need some adjustment, and in this context the Buddhist usage may be related to Classical Sanskrit *aupadhika* in the sense of "deceptive," but with a positive connotation, like *upāya*. If not, it could be translated "in regard to the material gift he…"

[32] This is both an abbreviated trope or stenciled passage and an editorial insertion to explain why the Buddha himself did not go to the meal. The full form of the trope is found in Sanskrit at, for example, *Cīvaravastu*, Dutt (1942–1950, Vol. III, Pt. 2, p. 128.3) and the other four reasons are because he wants to (1) enter seclusion, (2) teach *Dharma* to the gods, (3) inspect the bedding and seats, and (4) look after the sick. On editorial insertions and their use see Schopen (2000, pp. 157–158).

As in the case of the painting of the wheel of rebirth, here too there is an expectation that monks will not be competent to teach or explain, but here that expectation is not limited to any specific, even moderately complicated 'doctrine,' but is undefined and general, and—to judge by the context—might very well not have involved anything very sophisticated.[33] As in the case of the recitation of the *Prātimokṣa* too, and expressed in much the same language, this general incompetence was expected or thought possible at the highest level. Here too it was not junior monks who were the objects of concern or comment, but the most senior and, apparently, those of the highest rank. Secondarily, it is also worth noting that Mūlasarvāstivādin monks were only required by the rule delivered here to teach *Dharma* at the end of a meal to those donors who wanted it, suggesting, at least, that some may not have been particularly interested.

But the expectation of the incompetence of monks—even high-ranking monks—in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is not limited to teaching, whatever the subject, or to recitation and knowledge of monastic rules. It extends as well to what may have been common, even daily, liturgical contexts, as our final two examples would seem to show. They too involve recitation, one in-house, the other more decidedly public.

To judge by the work schedules assigned to certain errant monks, each day in a Mūlasarvāstivādin monastery was to both begin and end with a formal gathering involving the orderly arrangement of seats and the setting out of censers and incense. At this twice-daily communal gathering the primary activity appears to have been the performance of "the Proclamation of the Qualities of the Teacher" (*śāstṛguṇasaṃkīrttana*).[34] What exactly this was remains to be determined, but since it is commonly paired with the *Tridaṇḍaka*, which was clearly a three part recitative ritual, and both are the object of verbs meaning to recite, it too must have been, or referred to, a liturgical text or one type of recitation. It and the *Tridaṇḍaka* appear in fact to have been particularly marked out for ritual use: they, and they alone, were allowed to be—indeed required to be—recited with a certain "measured intonation" (*svaragupti*), which may have been something like "chant," and which the monks, presumably all monks, were supposed to learn.[35] But clearly all monks did not do so, and the compilers of the canonical *Vinaya* anticipated that this would be the case.

---

[33] It may, however, be too easy and mistaken to under-estimate the textual or doctrinal learning of laymen and their role in the transmission of texts; see Schopen (2009a, pp. 195–206; forthcoming a).

[34] For both schedules—one from the *Pārivāsikavastu*, the other from the *Kṣudrakavastu*—see Schopen (2004a, pp. 260–284).

[35] For the *Tridaṇḍaka*—uncharacteristically badly defined in Edgerton (1953)—see the old note in Schopen (1997, pp. 231–233, n. 62) which can, and should be, very much improved; for the moment see at least Śīlapālita's *Āgamakṣudrakavyākhyāna*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Dzu 25b.1 and 73a.5. The text in which the Buddha orders "Thus, the Proclamation of the Qualities of the Teacher and the recitation of the *Tridaṇḍaka* must be recited with measured intonation!" (*'di ltar ston pa'i yon tan yang dag par bsgrag pa dang / rgyud chags gsum pa gdon pa dag ni skad gyi gtang rag gis gdon par bya'o /*) occurs at *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Tha 45b.6–46b.5 (see also *Vinayasūtra*, Sankrityayana 1981, p. 55.11): *kuryāt śāstṛguṇasaṃkīrttane tridaṇḍakadāne ca svaraguptim*, and Lévi (1915, p. 431ff).

The errant monks who were assigned the task of reciting "the Proclamation of the Qualities of the Teacher" at the morning and evening communal gathering had committed an offence and were undergoing probation or penance. They therefore could have been monks of any status or standing, from very junior to very senior, and could easily have constituted a fairly typical cross-section of any given community. But once again the compilers of our *Vinaya* could foresee that any number of monks among this typical cross-section might not be capable of performing this common quotidian recitation, or made provisions to deal with such a situation. The version of the schedule that occurs in the *Pārivāsikavastu* is preserved in Sanskrit and says:

> When he knows that it is time and has arranged the seats, the censer[36] and incense must be set out. If he is able (*pratibala*) to perform the Proclamation of the Qualities of the Teacher, he himself must perform it. If not, a reciter (*bhāṣaṇaka* = *'chad pa po*) must be asked![37]

All of the previous examples and provisions render at least the situation envisioned in our final example unsurprising. It too deals with a situation in which a monk is incapable of performing what might seem the simplest of recitative functions, but unlike the previous examples it allows, in fact requires, a nun to fulfill the function that the monk cannot. Like the Proclamation of the Qualities of the Teacher, it too concerns a ritual procedure that could have been extremely common in the life of the Community. It at least is referred to scores of times in *Vinaya* narrative accounts. Oddly enough until very recently it has received little sustained attention.

When Buddhist monks were provided with a meal at a donor's house they were not, it seems, supposed to eat and run. Indeed, in a rich and recent study based on the Chinese translations of the Indian *Vinayas*, and indigenous commentaries, Koichi Shinohara has shown that in China the entire process of taking a meal was conceived of as a highly stylized and carefully orchestrated monastic ritual.[38] Much of what he says in regard to the Chinese sources holds for the Mūlasarvāstivādin sources preserved in Sanskrit and Tibetan, and they make it particularly clear that the final and in many ways most important moment in the ritual was what these sources describe as the "assigning of the reward": in Sanskrit this is expressed by the noun *dakṣiṇā* as the object of some form of the verbal root √*diś*, usually *ā*√*diś*, more rarely *ud*√*diś*, or the compound *dakṣiṇādeśanā*; in Tibetan these forms are usually translated by some form of *yon bshad pa*, *yon bsngo ba*, *sbyin pa bshad pa*,

36 For a recently published example of an inscribed censer see Falk (2006, pp. 402–406); for a well preserved painting of a monk holding one see Behl (1998, pp. 24–25). Portable censers are not infrequently mentioned in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*—see Schopen (2004a, p. 276, n. 7) and *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Cha 'dul ba 190a.3, 191a.5, Nya 38a.1 for a few more examples—and although Falk seems to want to associate their use with the *gandhakuṭī*, there is no evidence in these texts to support him. In these texts they are used—as here—at the daily communal assembly which did not take place in the *gandhakuṭī*, in leading visitors around the monastery, and commonly in the worship of the *stūpa*—Falk's censer in fact was donated at or to a *stūpa*.

37 *Pārivāsikavastu*, Dutt (1942–1950, Vol. III, Pt. 3, p. 97.16)

38 Shinohara (2010).

or one or another closely related forms, with a noticeable lack of consistency.[39] What this was is uncharacteristically clear. Edgerton defines *dakṣiṇādeśanā*, for example, as "assignment (to someone other than the donor or performer) of the profit from gifts or works of merit,"[40] and a series of Indian commentarial glosses which he appears not to have known essentially confirm this. In his commentary on the *Vibhaṅga* Vinītadeva, for example, says: *yon bshad pa zhes bya ba ni sbyin pa'i bras bu yongs su bsngo ba'o*, "'Assigning the reward' means: directing the fruit of the gift." Śīlapālita in his commentary on the *Kṣudrakavastu* first says: *yon bsngo ba ni chos kyi sbyin pa la sog pa las yang dag par byung ba'i bsod nams kyi bras bu kun tu bgo bsha' byed pa'o*, "'Assigning the reward' means: apportioning the fruit of the merit which arises from a religious gift, etc." Then later in commenting on the account of the founding of Pāṭaliputra in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-Sūtra*-–in the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* has not yet been extracted from its *Vinaya*, as it was in the Pāli tradition, and is still embedded in the *Kṣudrakavastu*—he glosses the expression twice. He says *yon shod cig ces bya ba ni sbyin pa'i 'bras bu yongs su bsngo ba'o*, "'Must assign the reward!' means: directing the fruit of the gift"; then: *yon gyi bshad pa zhes bya ba ni zas las byung ba'i bsod nams kyi 'bras bu lha rnams la yongs su bsngo par bya ba yin no /*, "'Assigning the reward' means: the fruit of the merit arising from the food is to be directed to the gods."[41] As in most of Shinohara's sources, in Mūlasarvāstivādin texts the "assignment" is effected narratively by the Buddha or a senior monk reciting a suitable verse; and in Mūlasarvāstivādin rule the recitation is ordinarily to be done by the Elder of the Community or *Saṅgha-sthavira*. Our final text indicates that a similar provision governed communities of nuns, but also deals with the additional complication that could arise when both nuns and monks were at the same meal. The text here is from the *Uttaragrantha*.

> [42]The Buddha, the Blessed One, was staying in the Jetavana, in the Park of Anāthapiṇḍada, and there was a householder living in a border city.[43] When he

[39] See for discussion and examples Schopen (1997, pp. 78–79, 229, n. 43, 231, n. 61; 2004a, index; 2004b, pp. 168, 174).

[40] Edgerton (1953).

[41] *Vinayavibhaṅgapadavyākhyāna*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Tshu 64b.5; *Āgamakṣudrakavyākhāna*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Dzu 73a.5, 190b.7, 191a.2.

[42] *Uttaragrantha*, Derge 'dul ba Pa 179a.3–b.4. For many of the Sanskrit equivalents inserted in what follows see *Vinayasūtra*, Sankrityayana (1981, p. 91.1) which is cited in full below.

[43] *ri brags kyi grong*, this is one of at least three slightly different Tibetan translations of what in Buddhist sources in Sanskrit usually appears as *karvaṭaka*—*ri brag*(*s*) and *ri 'or* also are used. There are good reasons for thinking that neither of the meanings listed in Edgerton for *karvaṭaka* is satisfactory. The second—"a high mountain hamlet"—is entirely based on a Tibetan translation that may not be accurate: usage suggests that the Sanskrit term does not refer so much to mountains but to distance from political control. Edgerton's first meaning—"a (mean, poor) village"—seems to work even less well since our *Vinaya* repeatedly refers to *karvaṭaka* as the home of extremely rich donors and the location of large, beautiful, well-endowed and wealthy monasteries—for just a few of many examples see *Cīvaravastu* (Dutt 1942–1950, Vol. III, Pt. 2, pp. 98.9, 105.15, 107.11, 108.16); *Vibhaṅga*, Derge 'dul ba Ca 153b.1, Cha 184a.1; *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Tha 230a.2; *Uttaragrantha*, Derge 'dul ba Pa 166a.3. In non-Buddhist sources too the *karvaṭaka* is no "mean village": in the *Kāmasūtra*, Śāstrī (1964) I.4.2, for example, it is one of the three types of urban settlements in which wealthy and cultured *nāgarakas* or "men-about-town" live. Clearly, the term needs further study.

had invited many nuns to a meal, then a single monk who was traveling through the countryside with many other travelers arrived at that border city, and when he set out there for alms someone said to him: "Noble One, nuns have been invited to a meal in this house here—you should go there!"

When he had gone there Sthūlanandā,[44] being the Elderess of the Female Community (*dge 'dun ma'i gnas brtan = saṅghasthavirī*) said: "Noble One, if you are capable (*nus na = śaktau*) of reciting the assignment of the reward (*sbyin pa'i yon tan brjod = dakṣiṇādeśanā*)[45] you must sit at the seniors' end of the assembly! If you are not capable, take your meal to one side, then you must go!"

He, having been embarrassed (*skyengs nas = lajjita*), thought to himself: "Since if I stay until the assignment of the reward my fellow-travelers will depart, eating my meal to one side, I will go." Having so thought, he ate his meal to one side and left.

In due course he arrived at Śrāvastī and the monks there said: "Venerable, has it gone well? Have your travels gone well?"

But he said: "How could it go well?—a nun has made a joke (*kyal ka = krīḍā*) of me."

"How so?" they said

He told the monks in detail what had occurred. The monks reported it to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One said: "Where a single monk and a single nun are staying there that monk must enjoy (*zo shig = √bhuj*) both the first seat, the first water, and the first food! (*gral kyang dang po / chu yang dang po / zan yang dang po = agrāsana*, *agrodaka*, *agrapiṇḍapāta*). Where there are two nuns or three or more than that, and if a single monk arrives, that single monk must enjoy both the first seat, the first water, and the first food! Even when there are only nuns one seat must always be set aside as the first seat and be placed there! Even if a male novice (*dge tshul pha = śrāmaṇera*) arrives he must sit there and eat! If too he is incapable (*de ste des mi nus par gyur na yang*) a nun must recite the assignment of the reward! If a nun does not do so she comes to be guilty of an offence.

The language of this text is—as it is throughout the various sections now found in the *Uttaragrantha*—not always as clear as one might want, and it has a number of

[44] Sthūlanandā is a strongly drawn nun in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* who is learned, trouble-making, and perhaps the most prominent member of "the Group-of-Twelve-Nuns," the female equivalent in every way to the Group-of-Six-Monks—for the latter see, for example, Schopen (2007); for some typical stories involving Sthūlanandā—her name means "Fat or Gross Nandā"—see Schopen (2004a, pp. 341–342; 2008a; 2009b; forthcoming b, c).

[45] The Tibetan here appears to represent yet another variant translation of *dakṣiṇādeśanā*, but that that was the Sanskrit here appears to be confirmed by the *Vinayasūtra* cited below.

atypical translations or non-standard usages, but the underlying Sanskrit vocabulary can usually be glimpsed, and it's general purport seems clear enough even if on some important points a certain amount of ambiguity remains. It appears first of all to be clarifying an old rule or applying it to a 'new' situation. It could be working off what is in the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition the eighth of the notorious *guru-dharmas* or heavy rules which nuns alone are subject to, which requires that a nun, even if she has been ordained for a hundred years, must show deference to a monk even if he has been ordained only one day.[46] But key elements of the vocabulary—the repeated reference to the first seat, water, and food—suggest rather that it is alluding to and building on what is now the opening section of the *Śayanāsa-navastu*. That *Vastu* begins with the assembled monks discussing the issue of determining status and preference among themselves, and the issue is framed in part by their asking "Who among us is entitled to use the first seat, the first water, the first alms food?" (*ko 'smākam arhati agrāsanam agrodakam agrapiṇḍapātaṃ paribhoktum iti*). This discussion too has a directive attributed to the Buddha that is similar to the eighth *gurudharma*: "All those who are ordained must show deference to one who was ordained earlier, except in the case of a nun: she—even if ordained for a hundred years—must show deference to a monk who has just been ordained that day!" (*sarveṣām upasaṃpannānāṃ pūrvopasaṃpannā vandyāḥ sthāpayitvā bhikṣuṇīṃ tasyā varṣaśatopasaṃpannāyā api tadahaḥ* (rd: *tad ahar*) *upasaṃpanno bhikṣur vandyaḥ*).[47] What is not specifically stated, however, in either the *gurudharma* or the *Śayanāsanavastu* is how this general principle should play out in a situation in which, for example, a single monk finds himself at a meal which had been offered to a group of nuns, and that, of course, is precisely the 'problem' that our *Uttaragrantha* text appears to address.[48] Its 'solution'—showing how the deference of nuns to monks is in such a case to be expressed—is not a surprise, even though it goes further than either the *gurudharma* or the *Śayanāsanavastu* by requiring that the deference be shown even to an unordained male, a novice or *śrāmaṇera*. Although this may seem to be a significant extension, it is important to note that the deference that was supposed to be shown even to a monk was purely ritual and had no effect on other important rights of nuns: a male may get the first of what is received, but the nuns receive an equal share. In the *Uttaragrantha* this has already been established in a little text that occurs more than a dozen folios before our text. That little text is built on the same narrative armature and is short enough to be cited here.

> [49]The Buddha, the Blessed One, was staying in the Jetavana of Śrāvastī, in the Park of Anāthapiṇḍada.

[46] *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Da 103a.5–104a.7.

[47] *Śayanāsanavastu*, Gnoli (1978, pp. 3–5).

[48] Sitting arrangements for meals attended by both nuns and monks elsewhere are not entirely clear. In a very short text at *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Da 177a.1–.4 it sounds as if only "two or three" nuns sat in accordance with seniority—i.e. senior nuns at the seniors' end of the assembly, etc.—and the rest of the nuns were to sit apart as a group. But at *Vibhaṅga*, Derge 'dul ba Nya 228b.5ff Sthūlanandā sits at the seniors' end of a mixed assembly and officiously takes charge of the distribution of the food, ordering the donor around.

[49] *Uttaragrantha*, Derge 'dul ba Pa 166a.3–.7.

> When 60 monks were wandering through the countryside and arrived at a border city there was a devout householder who lived there. When he had invited the monks to his house for a meal he thought: "I will give to each of the monks a piece of cloth."
>
> The monks began to eat and 60 nuns who were also wandering through the countryside also arrived at that border city. They began to beg for alms. Someone there said to them: "Since the monks are eating a meal in the house of that householder, you should go there!"
>
> They, going there, also ate and then that householder put down 60 pieces of cloth in front of the seniors' end of the assembly.
>
> When the monks did not know how to divide them the monks reported to the Blessed One what had occurred, and the Blessed One said: "Since they were obtained by both Communities they must be divided among both Communities!"

The ritual deference required of nuns is, then, just ritual. It does not entail here—and elsewhere—their economic disadvantage or any inequality in property rights.[50]

Ritual deference, however, is not the only issue the first of our *Uttaragrantha* texts deals with. It also addresses—like all the texts cited here—the issue of the incompetence or ignorance of monks in yet another common situation, although it is here more ambiguous. Narratively the nun Sthūlanandā first of all does not axiomatically assume that the arriving monk would be capable, because he was a monk, of performing the assignment of the reward. Indeed, her question to him would seem to imply an assumption that all monks were not able to do so. But whether this textual monk was able to or not remains ambiguous. He is embarrassed or ashamed, but at the same time the text leaves the impression that he did not take a seat at the seniors' end not because he was incapable of performing the assignment, but because he did not want to be left behind by the group he was travelling with. When our monk complains that Sthūlanandā made a joke of him it is then not clear how she did this: by making his incompetence publicly visible or by misrepresenting his intentions. And while it is clear that the text ends with the issue of male incompetence, there is a further ambiguity here as well, one that is common in these texts: the referent of the pronoun "he" (*des*) in the Buddha's penultimate statement is not certain: it could refer to the immediately preceding novice, or it could refer to any male member of the Community who arrives at a meal for nuns, even a novice. To decide with certainty which on the basis of the text alone is probably not possible, but the Mūlasarvāstivādin scholastic tradition would seem to strongly and consistently favor the second alternative. We might start with Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra*.

Guṇaprabha does not seem to have sensed any ambiguity in the penultimate statement of the Buddha in the *Uttaragrantha*—at least there is no trace of such in either his *Vinayasūtra* or his auto-commentary on it. His *sūtra* which appears to be

[50] To the same point see Schopen (2008b) and the texts treated there dealing with inheritance, and Schopen (forthcoming b).

digesting the *Uttaragrantha* statement does not even mention a novice. It reads in Sanskrit:

karaṇaṃ sabhikṣutāyām aśaktau teṣāṃ bhikṣuṇyā dakṣiṇādeśanasya [/]

In a shared situation with monks, when they have no competence, the performance of the assigning of the reward is (to be done) by a nun.

The *sūtra* is translated into Tibetan as

dge slong dang bcas pa nyid na de dag gis mi nus na dge slong mas yon bshad par bya'o /[51]

In his auto-commentary, moreover, he leaves no doubt who the "they" were who might be incompetent and appears to signal one the "shared situations."

[52]*dge slong dang bcas pa nyid na zhes bya ba ni mchod rten la yon bshad par bya'o zhes smos par rig par bya'o / de dag gis zhes bya ba ni dge slong rnams kyis so /*

In regard to the words "in a shared situation with monks," they are to be understood to be saying "at the *stūpa* the assigning of the reward is to be done (by a nun, etc.) In regard to the word "they," this means monks.

In light of both Dharmamitra's *Ṭīkā* and Prajñākara's *Vyākhyāna* on the *Vinayasūtra* one might be inclined to suspect that the auto-commentary's *mchod rten*, "stūpa," is an error for *mchod ston*, *maha*, "festival," but the reading in the Derge printing of the auto-commentary is clear, and the Peking version—the only other one I have access to—has the same reading. The *Ṭīkā* and *Vyākhyāna*, however, are also worth citing here because they introduce small but interesting differences in wording, and because they too make it clear in different ways that the "they" are monks, and monks alone. The first says:

[53]*dge slong dang bcas pa nyid na de dag gis mi nus na dge slong mas yon bshad par bya'o zhes bya ba ni / mchod ston la sogs pa dag la dge slong dang bcas pa nyid yin la / dge slong de dag gis yon bshad par byed mi nus na dge slong mas yon bshad par byar rung ba'o /*

The words "In a shared situation with monks, when they have no competence, the assigning of the reward is to be done by a nun" mean: at festivals, and so forth, when it is a shared situation with monks, if the monks are not competent to perform the assigning of the reward it is proper for a nun to perform the assigning of the reward.

[51] *Vinayasūtra*, Sankrityayana (1981, p. 91.1) = Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Wu 74a.2.

[52] *Vinayasūtravṛttyabhidhānasvavyākhyāna*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Zu147b.3.

[53] *Vinayasūtraṭīkā*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Yu 206a.5.

Here the one shared situation that is explicitly mentioned is a festival, *maha*, but it is also only one of an implied wider range of possible situations—*la sogs pa* = *ādi* indicating an unspecified number of others—and the monks who are incompetent are plural. The *Vyākhyāna* of Prajñākara is similar, but uses a different translation for the assignment (*sbyin pa bshad par bya*), refers only to the occasion of a festival (*mchod ston gyi tshe*), and makes the nun's performance imperative (*gyis shig*).[54] The *Vṛtti* on the *Vinayasūtra*, also attributed to Guṇaprabha, is different yet again:

> [55]*gtsug lag khang du yon bdag gis dge slong ba dang dge slong ma bshos gsol ba'i 'og tu tshigs bcad dge slong phas klog mi nus na dge slong ma mkhas pas kyang rung /*
>
> After a donor (*dānapati*) has provided a meal in the *vihāra* to monks and nuns, if a monk is not competent to read (*klog* = *paṭhati*, *vācayati*) the verse, it is proper for a learned (*mkhas pa* = *paṇḍita*) nun to do it.

The *Vṛtti* returns to the occasion of a meal, although it is simply a joint meal without any mention of a numerical preponderance of nuns, and it takes place in a monastery. It is also the only source that adds a qualification to the nun who might perform the assignment: she is said to be "learned." But like all the sources connected with the *Vinayasūtra*, it makes no mention of a novice, and here too it is the global category "monks" who might prove incompetent.

The *Vinayasūtra* and the commentarial texts which cluster around it are not, however, the only scholastic texts that treat the *Uttaragrantha* passage. It is also digested in Viśākhadeva's *Vinayakārikā*, and it might serve as a final example.

> [56]*gcig pu mgron du bos pa la*
> *dge slong ma rnams 'khod pa na*
> *gang du dge slong zas kyi phyir*
> *'dug pa'i stan ni dang por bzhag //*
> *dge tshul gyis ni gral yang rung*
> *de ru 'dug ste zos nas ni*
> *gal te dge slong nus med na*
> *dge slong ma yis yon bshad bya //*
>
> When there is a single one (i.e. monk) at an invited meal, and the nuns are seated, a seat for sitting must first be arranged so that a monk can eat on it.
>
> The mat is proper even for a novice. When sitting on it, if, after eating, the monk is incompetent, the assignment of the reward must be performed by a nun!

Being wedged into lines of seven syllables the text here is a little crabbed, but once again the general sense seems clear enough, and although the *kārikā* contains

[54] *Vinayasūtravyākhyāna*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Ru 208b.7.

[55] *Vinayasūtravṛtti*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Lu 266a.7.

[56] *Vinayakārikā*, Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Shu 54a.4.

explicit reference to a novice, the rule itself refers to the incompetence or inability of a monk to perform the assignment at an invited meal. Like the canonical text, the *kārikā* speaks only of such meals, and there is little else new here.

But lest the welter of details obscure it, it is worth noting an otherwise obvious and striking difference between our last canonical example dealing with the assignment of the reward and the texts dealing with the painting of the wheel of rebirth, the appointment of the Admonisher-of-Nuns, the recitation of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, teaching *Dharma* to a donor of a meal, and the Proclamation of the Qualities of the Teacher. All of these could have been common and repeated occurrences: one would have been daily, two bimonthly. Two again would have been private (appointing the Admonisher, reciting the *Prātimokṣa*), one would have involved interaction with the laity but would have taken place at the monastery (the painting), and two would have been overwhelmingly public (teaching *Dharma* to a donor and assigning the reward). The last of these—which is our last example as well—is set by our sources in several different locations or events: in the *Uttaragrantha* it occurs in a lay man's home; in the *Vinaya-Sūtra* in a shared or mixed situation of monks and nuns, none of which were supposed to occur in private; in the various commentaries on the *Vinaya-Sūtra* "at the stūpa" (i.e. outside), at festivals (i.e. public events), and once at an invited meal in a *vihāra* sponsored by a donor who presumably was present. But it is on one of the two most public of occurrences, and on this one alone that our texts not only allow, but *require* that an incompetent monk be replaced by a nun. If nothing else, this stipulation points to the absolutely critical, obligatory character of the assignment of the reward: unlike even the bimonthly recitation of the *Prātimokṣa*, it cannot not be done. While it is true, or at least seems to be narratively so in the *Uttaragrantha*, that if there is a competent monk even at an invited meal for nuns he would be expected to perform the assignment, this in fact is never actually stated, nor is it said in the *Uttaragrantha* passage—or anywhere else that I know of—that any nun was incapable of performing it. This might be related to, or further reflect, the refined or elevated (learned?) speech habits of nuns which seem to be implied in the requirement that a monk who was to admonish nuns be "possessed of urbane speech," and may provide another piece to the picture of a very different Buddhist nun than the one we are used to. But however this turns out the fact remains that our last text is striking. It not only allows, but requires that a nun, in the presence of a monk and in a very public sphere, act at the head of the mixed assembled group, and fulfill the primary ritual role. This procedure would have made the stature of the nun publicly visible. But it would have made the incompetence of the monk or monks who were present equally, and just as publicly, visible. And yet it was required, and the nun who did not do so was guilty of an offence. This surely is remarkable.

We might end here with some even broader considerations, and by asking how it is that modern scholarly assumptions—most often, perhaps, unspoken—about the level of learning and textual knowledge of Buddhist monks can differ so much from those that seem to have been held by the redactors of a good deal of Buddhist monastic literature. This, of course, is a complex issue and only a few of the many factors that are probably involved can be touched upon.

Those scholars—and they are many—who assume that mainstream canonical *Sūtra* and *Vinaya* literature is old and has been transmitted over a long period of

time rarely, if ever, acknowledge the fact that there is very little evidence in the various *Vinayas* that would support the notion that the Buddhist tradition had developed, or had in place, a sufficiently sophisticated system that would allow them to transmit anything like the enormous bulk of canonical literature that we know. There is a stunning contrast between what is seen in brahmanical sources where elaborate procedures and mechanisms were put in place to insure the transmission of what in comparison is a very small textual corpus. Indeed, in the brahmanical case an entire culture was organized around this goal, and every brahman male was expected to undergo a more or less intense period of training in the limited textual corpus of the *Veda*. By contrast Buddhist sources give little or no indication that there was anything like a prolonged period of "studentship" during which its textual corpus could be acquired.[57] What little these sources say about transmitting a textual corpus from generation to generation is oddly casual and certainly unsystematic, and the recitation (i.e. learning) of texts is not even required, or only one option for a Buddhist monk.[58] And by way of another contrast, there is nothing in the *Vinayas* to suggest anything even vaguely like the elaborate system of monastic education found at least in late Tibet, and even here only a small number of monks fully pursued it, and it remained optional, the vast majority remaining textually barely educated.[59] So, while the topic of textual training and learning in the various *Vinayas* has been too long ignored and needs careful study, one of the reasons why the redactors of *Vinaya* literature made so many rules to deal with situations in which monks were deficient or incompetent in doctrinal or textual learning may well have been that—unlike many modern scholars—they were fully aware that their communities lacked established, systematic mechanisms and procedures that would insure even a moderate level of textual learning on the part of ordinary monks. But a second possible reason might also be entertained.

Even if—contrary to all indications—Buddhist monastic communities in early India had a moderately rigorous procedure for educating their monks doctrinally and textually, that procedure may not have worked very well for a considerable number of entrants: they may have been too old to gain much from it. It is of course true that virtually nothing is known about the age of men who entered actual Buddhist monasteries in India. All we really have are stories. But, although again they have yet to be systematically surveyed, in a significant number of stories about men becoming monks—at least in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*—the men involved were not young. Here a few examples must suffice.

Very often accounts of men who become Buddhist monks start there with what amounts to a narrative trope: "When the householder had lost his relatives, his wealth and property, he thought to himself: 'Now since I am old I am unable to get rich. Since I also have no property, and my relatives are dead as well, I should go and enter the Order'" (*dus gzhan zhig na de nye du rnams kyang zad par gyur / nor yang zad / longs*

[57] While it is true, for example, that Buddhist monks had to enter into and remain in a state of dependence (*niśraya*) on an *ācārya* or *upādhyāya*, usually for a period of at least five years after their ordination, this relationship was not defined primarily in terms of teaching, but in terms of service and care-giving, at least in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*—see Schopen (2004a, pp. 8–9).

[58] See, for example, *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Tha 213b.3–214a.7, and Schopen (2005, pp. 68–75).

[59] Onoda (1992) and Dreyfus (2003).

spyod kyang zad nas / des bsams pa / da ni bdag rgas pas nor bsgrub par bya yang mi nus / bdag la longs spyod dag kyang med / bdag gi nye du rnams kyang dus las 'das bas / song la rab tu 'byung ngo snyam du rigs nas…),[60] and he does so. This trope is found widely in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*—in its *Kṣudrakavastu*, *Pravrajyāvastu*, *Vibhaṅga*, etc.[61]—and there are numerous other accounts that sketch something similar. In the *Vibhaṅga* a grown man from a brahman family who is very stupid (*cūḍaḥ paramacūḍo dhanvaḥ paramadhanvaḥ*) and cannot make a living after his father's death is encouraged to become a Buddhist monk by his brother, and does so; in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* a barber and his grown son become monks; in the *Kṣudrakavastu* tradesmen or artisans (*bzo bo* = *śilpin*) with grown sons and daughters do so; in the *Cīvaravastu* an old householder who had acquired an enormous fortune seeks to enter the Order; in the *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu* a mature man who had run, after his father's death, a successful business to support his mother enters the Order only after her death.[62] All these men are not young people, but mature men of considerable years and domestic experience, with, in the main, probably limited formal education, and yet this is only a very small sampling of what is found in this *Vinaya*. In the first examples cited here the men in question are very old, at or even beyond the end of their productive years, and one cannot help but be reminded of the classical description of the men who become renouncers in the *āśrama* system: these men become Buddhist monks when they are unable or too old to do anything else. And here these stories intersect with another commonplace in this *Vinaya*, one that has parallels in other *Vinayas*: the ignorance or foolishness of old monks, commonly called *mahallakas*. In a study based in large part on *Vinaya* literature preserved in Chinese Durt has noted that the "vocation tardive" was "peu appréciée dans le bouddhisme indian," that the term *mahalla* may well have had the sense of "senile," that old monks were characterized by "stupidity" or "la bétise congénitale," and that many stories concerning old monks in this *Vinaya* "ont un aspect burlesque."[63] von Hinüber has found similar characterizations in the Pāli *Vinaya*, noting that "the image of old monks is rather negative in Theravāda Buddhism," and that "Learning texts by heart, particularly if voluminous, was indeed a problem in particular for those Buddhist monks who entered the order only at an advanced age."[64] All of this and more is found as well in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, so commonly in fact that the *mahalla* as a silly, senile, and gullible old monk becomes something of a stock character in yet another narrative trope in which the Group-of-Six rather shamelessly manipulate or take advantage of

[60] *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Tha 100a.4.

[61] Examples may be found at *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Tha 100a.3, Da 138b.4; *Pravrajyāvastu*, Eimer (1983, Vol. II, p. 193.14); *Vibhaṅga*, Derge 'dul ba Ja 90b.6.

[62] *Vibhaṅga*, Derge 'dul ba Ja 61a.4-71b.4 = *Divyāvadāna*, Cowell and Neil (1886, pp. 483–495); *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, Dutt (1942–1950, Vol. III, Pt. 1, pp. 280.8–281.18); *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge 'dul ba Da 87a.6–87b.6; *Cīvaravastu*, Dutt (1942–1950, Vol. III, Pt. 2, pp. 139.6–143.14) = Schopen (2004a, pp. 117–119); *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*, Yamagiwa (2001, pp. 64–67, 158–159).

[63] Durt (1980, esp. pp. 93, 94, 97).

[64] von Hinüber (1997, esp. pp. 74, 71). It should be noted that neither Durt nor von Hinüber refer to "old" nuns, but there certainly are some in the literature, beginning, of course, with Mahāprajāpatī. This topic will have to be studied, as will the issue of incompetent nuns. There are references to such nuns, though they seem to be comparatively few.

them—these tales too very often have "un aspect burlesque."[65] Any number of other examples might be cited, but perhaps the point is clear: old monks, or men who entered the Order in old age, were represented in a great deal of monastic literature as silly, if not senile, and in some of this literature they are also represented as both numerous and dangerous.[66] They certainly would have been seen as incompetent. But if, for example, the stories the redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* told were anything like the realities that they lived with, then one more reason why they put in place so many rules related to the incompetence of their monks may well have been that many of those monks were old, and our redactors knew that—and now being one myself I can say it with some authority—it is hard to teach an old dog new tricks!

References

Banerjee, A. C. (1957). *Sarvāstivāda literature*. Calcutta: D. Banerjee.

Banerjee, A. C. (1977). *Two Buddhist Vinaya texts in Sanskrit. Prātimokṣa sūtra and bhikṣukarmavākya*. Calcutta: The World Press Private Limited.

Behl, B. K. (1998). *The Ajanta caves. Artistic wonder of ancient Buddhist India*. London: Harry N. Abrams, Inc.

Chung, J. (1998). *Die Pravāraṇā in den kanonischen Vinaya-Texten der Mūlasarvāstivādin und der Sarvāstivādin*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Beiheft 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Clarke, S. (2000). The existence of the supposedly non-existent *Śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī*: A new perspective on *pārājika* penance. *Bukkyō Kenkyū, 29*, 149–176.

Clarke, S. (2009). Monks who have Sex: Pārājika penance in Indian Buddhist monasticisms. *Journal of Indian Philosophy, 37*, 1–43.

Cone, M. (2001). *A dictionary of Pāli. Part I*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.

Cowell, E. B., & Neil, R. A. (1886). *The Divyāvadāna. A collection of early Buddhist legends*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dreyfus, G. B. J. (2003). *The sound of two hands clapping. The education of a Tibetan Buddhist monk*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Durt, H. (1980). Mahalla/mahallaka et la crise de la communauté après le parinirvāṇa du Buddha. In *Indianisme et bouddhisme. Mélanges offerts à Mgr Étienne Lamotte*. Publications de L'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 23 pp. 79–99). Louvain-La-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain.

Dutt, N. (1942–1950). *Gilgit manuscripts* (Vol. III, Pts. 1–4). Srinagar: Calcutta Oriental Press.

Edgerton, F. (1953). *Buddhist hybrid Sanskrit grammar and dictionary* (Vol. II). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Eimer, H. (1983). *Rab Tu 'Byuṅ Ba'i Gži. Die tibetische Übersetzung des Pravrajyāvastu im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Asiatische Forschungen Bd. 82 (2 Teil). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Falk, H. (2006). Three inscribed Buddhist monastic utensils from Gandhāra. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 156.2*, 393–412.

Goldstein, M. C. (2001). *The new Tibetan–English dictionary of modern Tibetan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

[65] For two examples see *Cīvaravastu*, Dutt (1942–1950, Vol. III, Pt. 2, pp. 98.9–102.14); *Vibhaṅga*, Derge 'dul ba Cha 184a.1–188a.5.

[66] They are represented, for example, as offensive to the locals, both human and divine. At *Vibhaṅga*, Derge 'dul ba Ja 203a.3–204a.6 lay men who are staying at the *vihāra* for an all-night recitation of the *Dharma* lose their faith when they hear a *mahallaka* who had fallen asleep and was dreaming about sleeping with his former wife raving about it in his sleep; in both the *Varṣāvastu*, Dutt (1942–1950, Vol. II, Pt. 4, pp. 148.10–150.3) and the *Pravāraṇavastu*, Chung (1998, pp. 159–162) *mahallas* verbally abuse, shout at, and grope women and girls of good families on roads or in fields, and their male relatives come to the monastery intending to kill, bind or expel the monks; *mahallas* also offend the local spirits by throwing slops and other impure things all around there and the spirits attack the monks. In both the behavior of *mahallas* seriously threatens the well-being of the entire community.

Gnoli, R. (1978). *The Gilgit manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu. Being the 15th and 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Serie Orientale Roma 50. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

Horner, I. B. (1938–1966). *The book of the discipline* (6 Vols.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lévi, S. (1915). Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques. *Journal Asiatique,* 401–447.

Norman, K. R. (1992). *Collected papers* (Vol. III). Oxford: The Pali Text Society.

Oldenberg, H. (1879–1883). *The Vinaya Piṭakaṃ. One of the principle Buddhist holy scriptures in the Pāli language* (5 Vols.). London: Williams and Norgate.

Onoda, S. (1992). *Monastic debate in Tibet. A study of the history and structures of Bsdus Grwa logic*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 27. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.

Peri, N. (1917). Hārītī la mère-de-démons. *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, 17*, 1–102.

Pruitt, W., & Norman, K. R. (2003). *The Pātimokkha*. Sacred books of the Buddhists 49. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.

Sakaki, R. (1916). *Mahāvyutpatti*. Kyoto.

Sankrityayana, R. (1981). *Vinayasūtra of Bhadanta Gunaprabha*. Singhi Jain Śāstra Śikṣāpīṭha/Singhi Jain Series 74. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.

Śāstrī, D. (1964). *The Kāmasūtram of Śrī Vātsyāyana Muni*. Kashi Sanskrit Series 29. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Schopen, G. (1997). *Bones, stones, and Buddhist monks. Collected papers on the archaeology, epigraphy, and texts of monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Schopen, G. (2000). Hierarchy and housing in a Buddhist monastic code. A translation of the *Śayanāsanavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Part One. *Buddhist Literature, 2*, 92–196.

Schopen, G. (2004a). *Buddhist monks and business matters. Still more papers on monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Schopen, G. (2004b). On Buddhist monks and dreadful deities: Some monastic devices for updating the Dharma. In H. W. Bodewitz & M. Hara (Eds.), *Gedenkschrift J.W. de Jong*. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series 17 (pp. 161–184). Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Schopen, G. (2004c). Making men into monks. In D. S. Lopez, Jr. (Ed.), *Buddhist scriptures* (pp. 230–251). London: Penguin Books.

Schopen, G. (2005). *Figments and fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India. More collected papers*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Schopen, G. (2006). The Buddhist "Monastery" and the Indian garden: Aesthetics, assimilations, and the siting of monastic establishments. *Journal of the American Oriental Society, 126.4*, 487–505.

Schopen, G. (2007). The learned monk as a comic figure: on reading a Buddhist Vinaya as Indian literature. *Journal of Indian Philosophy, 35*, 201–226.

Schopen, G. (2008a). On emptying chamber pots without looking and the urban location of Buddhist nunneries in early India again. *Journal Asiatique, 296*, 229–256.

Schopen, G. (2008b). Separate but equal: Property rights and the legal independence of Buddhist nuns and monks in early north India. *Journal of the American Oriental Society, 128.4*, 625–640.

Schopen, G. (2009a). On the absence of Urtexts and Otiose Ācāryas: Buildings, books, and lay Buddhist ritual at Gilgit. In G. Colas & G. Gerschheimer (Eds.), *Écrire et transmettre en Inde classique* (pp. 189–219). Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Schopen, G. (2009b). The urban Buddhist nun and a protective rite for children in early north India. In M. Straube et al. (Eds.), *Pāsādikadānaṃ. Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika*. Indica et Tibetica 52 (pp. 359–380). Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

Schopen, G. (forthcoming a). The book as a sacred object in private homes in early or medieval India. In J. Jahner & E. Robertson (Eds.), *Translations of the sacred: Medieval and early modern devotional objects in global perspective*.

Schopen, G. (forthcoming b). On Buddhist nuns and business laws: Two examples from early India. In R. R. French (Ed.), *Buddhism and law*.

Schopen, G. (forthcoming c). The Buddhist nun as an urban landlord and a 'legal person' in early India.

Shinohara, K. (2010). Taking a meal at a lay supporter's residence. The evolution of the practice in Chinese Vinaya commentaries. In J. A. Benn et al. (Eds.), *Buddhist monasticism in east Asia. Places of practice* (pp. 18–42). London: Routledge.

Singh, S., & Minowa, K. (1988). A critical edition and translation of Abhisamācārikā Nāma Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇakaḥ. *Buddhist Studies, 12*, 81–146.

Teiser, S. F. (2006). *Reinventing the wheel. Paintings of rebirth in medieval Buddhist temples*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

von Hinüber, O. (1997). Old age and old monks in Pāli Buddhism. In S. Formanek & S. Linhart (Eds.), *Aging. Asian concepts and experiences past and present*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 643 (pp. 65–78). Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Yamagiwa, N. (2001). *Das Pāṇḍulohitakavastu. Über die verschiedenen Verfahrensweisen der Bestrafung in der buddhistischen Gemeinde*. Indica et Tibetica 41. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

Zin, M., & Schlingloff, D. (2007). *Saṃsāracakra. Das Rad der Wiedergeburten in der indischen Überlieferung*. Buddhismus-Studien 6. Düsseldorf: EKO-Hauses der Japanischen Kultur.